<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 11-18 are pending in the application. Claims 11, 15 and 16 are independent. No claims are amended in this response.

The Office Action rejects claims 11 and 13-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as over Lancelot et al. (USP 6,026,086) (hereinafter "Lancelot") in view of Hamamoto et al. (USP 6,038,233) (hereinafter "Hamamoto"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

<u>Claim 11</u>

Claim 11 recites, in part: "a first address translator for translating <u>initial address information</u> carried by packets received from at least one terminal device <u>into address information</u> carrying information about:

(a) the <u>predetermined transmission properties to be used for transmitting the associated packets</u>" (emphasis added).

In the "Response to Arguments" section of the final Office action it is argued that the "service type" field in Hamamoto teaches a field that stores information indicative of a service quality of communication processing. Even assuming arguendo that this assertion is correct, there is no disclosure nor suggestion of converting an address to an address information carrying service type information. Nowhere does Hamamoto describe that the service type information is address information or even related to address information. In Hamamoto the service type is a completely <u>separate field</u> than the address information.

In response to applicant's above argument, it is contended on page 5 of the final Office action, "Response to Arguments" section, that Lancelot teaches an address translator, which translates an address and Hamamoto discloses a packet carrying the predetermined transmission properties and a service field.

However, none of the references even suggests the above claimed features. Simply converting an address to a different address as apparently taught by Lancelot and having a service type field in a header as suggested in Hamamoto does not suggest to one skilled in the art a first address translator for translating initial address information carried by packets received from at least one terminal device into address information carrying

information about: (a) the predetermined transmission properties to be used for transmitting the associated packets.

Therefore, neither of Lancelot or Hamamoto teaches or even suggests at least the above claimed features and, for at least the foregoing reasons, applicant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness according to MPEP 2142 has not been established and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that claim 11 is allowable.

Claims 13-14 and 17-18 depend upon allowable claim 11 and are also allowable at least by virtue of their dependency therefrom and because each claim further recites distinguishing features.

Claim 15

Claim 15 recites in part a "first address translation providing address information within the packet header designating the address of the destination node and predetermined transmission properties to be used for transmitting the associated packets."

The analysis of independent claim 15 is substantially analogous to the analysis of claim 11, as presented hereinabove. To avoid repetition, claim 15 will not be discussed in detail with the understanding that it is patentable at least for the same reasons as claim 11. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 15 should be withdrawn.

Claim 16

Claim 16 recites in part a "communication method comprising … translating initial address information carried by packets received from at least one terminal device into address information carrying information about the transmission properties to be used for transmission of the packets."

The analysis of independent claim 16 is substantially analogous to the analysis of claim 11, as presented hereinabove. To avoid repetition, claim 16 will not be discussed in detail with the understanding that it is patentable at least for the same reasons as claim 11. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 16 should be withdrawn.

Claim 12

The Office Action rejects claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Lancelot in view of Aramaki.

Since claim 12 depends from claim 11, applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 12 should be withdrawn as Lancelot fails to teach or suggest all the features of claim 11 as admitted in the Office Action. For Example, Lancelot fails to teach at least: "(a) the predetermined transmission properties to be used for transmitting the associated packets.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections of record and allowance of this application are solicited. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian S. Myers/
Date: September 12, 2008   Brian S. Myers
                                        Registration No.: 46,947
                                        For Eric Bram,
                                        Registration No.: 37,285

Mail all correspondence to:
Eric Bram, Registration No.: 37,285
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001